

[Handwritten signature]



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

[Handwritten mark]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/286,087	04/02/99	GAN	H 476-1737
------------	----------	-----	------------

┌

WM01/1009

└

LEE MANN SMITH MCWILLIAMS
SWEENEY AND OHLSON
P O BOX 2786
CHICAGO IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

SOBUTKA, P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

[Handwritten mark]

DATE MAILED: 10/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

[Handwritten signature]

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/286,087

Applicant(s)

GAN ET AL.

Examiner

Philip J. Sobutka

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. Claims 1,2,3,5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Houde et al (US 5,623,532).

Consider claims 1-3,5. Houde teaches a method for migrating subscriber data associated with subscriber identities from a first HLR node to a second HLR node comprising the step of sequentially for each subscriber to be migrated transferring active subscriber data associated with the identity from the first node to the second node (Houde see especially figs 3,7). Note that Houde teaches a diversion function wherein transactions addressed for a subscriber identity arriving at one node are forwarded to the other node (Houde see especially fig 8), Therefore, the first, diverted, node would be in standby, while the new node is active.

2. Claims 1-3,5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ericsson et al (US 5,956,637).

Consider claims 1-3,5. Ericsson teaches migrating data corresponding to subscriber identities between two or more HLRs (Ericsson see especially col 3, lines 10-37). Note that Ericsson teaches diverting transactions from one HLR to the other HLR where the subscriber is active (Ericsson, see especially col 4, lines 28-47). Therefore, the first HLR would be in standby, while the second is active.

As to claim 6, note that Ericsson's transfer includes changing the status to indicate the present area of activity (Ericsson, see especially col 4, lines 28-47).

As to claim 7, note that the transfer would effectively "disable" the data in the first HLR (Ericsson see especially see especially col 14, lines 11-62).

As to claims 8-10, note that the routing pointer in the first HLR would effectively change the data in the first HLR to "standby" while the data in the second data HLR would be active (Ericsson see especially see especially col 14, lines 11-62).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 11,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houde et al.

Houde teaches everything claimed as shown above except for the method being stored as a program on a computer readable medium. Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously well known in the art to store methods as programs on a computer readable medium. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Houde to store the method as a program on a computer readable medium in order to allow the method to be easily and quickly transferred to another system.

4. Claims 11,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericsson et al.

Ericsson teaches everything claimed as shown above except for the method being stored as a program on a computer readable medium. Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously well known in the art to store methods as programs on a computer readable medium. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ericsson to store the method as a program on a computer readable medium in order to allow the method to be easily and quickly transferred to another system.

Art Unit: 2683

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericsson et al (US 5,956,637) in view of Nguyen (US 6,021,327).

Ericsson teaches everything claimed as shown above except for the data being deleted from the first HLR. Nguyen teaches deleting data from a location register in which a subscriber is no longer active (Nguyen col 1, lines 45-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ericsson to delete the subscriber data from a register where the subscriber was no longer active in order to prevent the registers from filling the databases with information that is no longer needed.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 7-16-01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants arguments regarding Houde's migration not taking place "on line" do not reflect the invention as claimed, since the claim does not mention the limitation that the migration takes place "on-line", nor has the applicant indicated the supporting disclosure for what would constitutes "on line" migration.

Applicant's arguments regarding Ericsson not teaching data migration are not understood since Ericsson clearly addresses the issue of migrating subscriber data from a HLR to a VLR, as noted in the cited passages in the rejection above.

Conclusion

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 2683

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Sobutka whose telephone number is 703-305-4825. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-6296 for regular communications and 703-308-6296 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2683

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

pjs
October 3, 2001


WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800